REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9, and 12-18 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 1 has been amended herein. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested since it removes issues in the event of an appeal, does not require further searching, and/or places the subject application in condition for allowance. Claims 19-35 and 37-41 have been withdrawn and claims 8, 10, 11 and 36 have been cancelled. A listing of all claims can be found at pages 2-8.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9, and 12-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9, and 12-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass *et al.* (U.S. Appln. No. 2005/0060643) in view of Kephart (U.S. 6,732,149). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Glass *et al.* nor Kephart disclose each element as set forth in the subject claims.

The subject application relates to identifying both legitimate and undesirable mail. (*See* Abstract.) Specifically, the subject application relates to extracting message features particular to span to facilitate span prevention. (*See id.*) Independent claim 1, from which claims 2-7, 9 and 12-18 depend recites, in part, *a system that facilitates extracting data in connection with spam processing, comprising ...* ***an analysis component that examines consecutiveness of characters within a subject line of a message and a content type of the message for spam in connection with building a filter, wherein the content type is case-sensitive, comprises primary content-type and a secondary-content type, or combinations thereof.*** Monitoring the content type identified in the message can help detect and identify spam since spammers attempt to mimic qualities of non-spam messages. (*See e.g.,* pg. 9, lns. 11-12 and pg. 18, lns. 1-2.) The content type can be case-sensitive to more accurately capture variations in content-type notations provided by message sending applications. (*See e.g.,* pg. 3, lns. 23-25.) Further, content-type can be case-sensitive to more accurately capture variations of primary and/or secondary MIME content-types. (*See e.g.,* pg. 9, lns. 12-14.) Further, primary content-type and secondary-content type can help identify messages that are forged or misrepresented to make the message appear to

be non-spam. (*See e.g.,* pg. 3, lns. 16-19 and pg. 14, lns. 5-7.) The cited art does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least these novel features.

Glass *et al.* relates to document similarity detection and a classification system. Glass *et al.* compares documents to determine a highest level of resemblance between an unclassified document and a set of previously classified documents. (*See* Abstract.) Thus, Glass *et al.* is concerned with *preclassifying* documents to aid in comparing the documents. This is simply placing the documents in a similar format for comparison, it is not examining a content type of the message for spam, as claimed. Further, as conceded, Glass *et al.* does not teach or suggest that the analysis component examines the consecutiveness of characters within a subject line of the message and Kephart is incorrectly relied upon to overcome the deficiencies of Glass *et al.*

Kephart relates to hindering an undesirable transmission or receipt of electronic messages. Specifically Kephart discusses a method for computing HashBlock data for a given message. (*See* col. 13, ln. 65 to col. 14, lns. 25.) The HashBlock is defined as a block of data computed from the body of the archetype and is used to measure overall similarity to other messages. (*See* col. 10 ln. 67 to col. 11, ln. 3.) The method includes transforming the message body, dividing the transformed message body into small individual units that might overlap, and for each individual unit, a hash function maps that unit to a small integer hash value. (*See* col. 13, ln. 65 to col. 14, lns. 25.) An array of these hash value counts is kept and is incremented by 1 each time a particular hash value is computed. (*See id.*). While describing the method, Kephart provides an example individual unit as being "all consecutive 5-character sequences". However, Kephart does not teach or suggest examining consecutiveness of characters *within a subject line of the message,* as claimed. Kephart merely utilizes the term "consecutive" in an example while discussing the method for deriving HashBlock Data from the *message body.* Further, Kephart is silent regarding examining a content type of the message for spam, as claimed.

Based on at least the above, it is apparent that neither Glass *et al.* nor Kephart teach or suggest all claim elements of independent claim 1 and, therefore, cannot teach or suggest all claim elements of claims that depend there from. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP573US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Patrica S. Murphy/
Patrica S. Murphy
Reg. No. 55,964

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731